

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,175	04/13/2004	Mary J. Ruwart	RUW-1001	6078
7590 10/06/2005			EXAMINER	
Nancy Lord Jo	ohnson, Ltd.		MCCORMICK EWO	LDT, SUSAN BETH
Suite 3 361 South Frontage Rd.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	Pahrump, NV 89048			

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/823,175	RUWART, MARY J.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		S. B. McCormick-Ewoldt	1655
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	ntion appears on the cover sheet with	n the correspondence address
WHIC - Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI nasions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuters to reply within the set or extended period for reply will received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repication. ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ly be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	ea patent term adjustment. See 37 St N 1.704(b).		
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>19 August 2005</u> .	
	•	∑ This action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition fo	r allowance except for formal matte	rs, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice	under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the app	olication.	-
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		y the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection		-
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to b		
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	r foreian priority under 35 U.S.C. &	119(a)-(d) or (f).
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		(4) (2)
	1. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been received.	
		cuments have been received in Ap	plication No
		the priority documents have been r	
	application from the Internationa		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action f	or a list of the certified copies not re	eceived.
		-	
Attachmen	• •	🗂	
1) 🔼 Notic 2) 🗌 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO	4) LI Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
			ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT	C/3B/08)	official rate in Application (F10-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/823,175

Art Unit: 1655

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant has cancelled the claims drawn to different inventions so the restriction requirement is moot.

Claims Pending

Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 18-29. Claims 1 and 3-17 will be examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mease et al. (US 6,201,022 B1), McClung (US 6,579,543 B1) and Murad (US 2003/0007930).

Mease et al. (US 6,201,022 B1) discloses a composition with omega-3, that contains eiosapentaenoic acid (EPA), docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) and gamma-linolenic acid (GLA)), a pharmaceutical acceptable carrier such as cocoa butter and vitamin E (i.e. tocopherols) to be used in a composition for treating neuritic pain syndrome such as brought on by burns (column 3, lines 62-67; column 4, lines 57-67 and column 5, lines 2-8, 53-55; Table 2 and Example 11). Mease et al. do not disclose using lavender oil, Sodium PCA or Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane.

McClung (US 6,579,543 B1) discloses a composition to be applied for relief of pain brought and by burns and sunburns. The composition contains methyl-sulfonyl-methane (MSM) lavender and omega-3 (column 2, lines 25-35, 67; column 3, lines 46-56; column 4, lines 16-46; column 17, lines 22-23, 55).

Murad (US 2003/0007930) discloses a topical composition for dermatological conditions caused by aging or by extrinsic factors such as sunlight or radiation and wrinkles and sun

Art Unit: 1655

damaged skin. The composition contains hydrophic agents such as tocopherols (vitamin E) and moisturizing agents such as sodium PCA and omega-3 which contains gamma-linolenic acid ([0043], 0044], [0053], [0054], [0055]).

These references taken together disclose a composition that comprises omega-3, tocopherols, cocoa butter, lavender, sodium PCA and Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane that can be used to relieve pain due to burns. Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that omega-3, tocopherols, cocoa butter, lavender, sodium PCA and Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane would be used to relieve pain from burns as taught by the references. Based on this reasonable expectation of success, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the teachings of the references.

These references show that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to use omega-3, tocopherols, cocoa butter, lavender, sodium PCA and Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane in compositions that aid in relief from burns and other dermatitis conditions. It is well known that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. *In re* Pinten, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); *In re* Susi, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80; 440 F.2d 442, 445; 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); *In re* Crockett, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21; 279 F.2d 274, 276-277; 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960).

Based on the disclosure by these references that omega-3, tocopherols, cocoa butter, lavender, sodium PCA and Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane are used in compositions that aid in relief from burns and other dermatitis conditions, an artisan of ordinary skill would have a reasonable expectation that a combination of the substances would also be useful in creating compositions aid in relief from burns and other dermatitis conditions. Therefore, the artisan would have been motivated to combine omega-3, tocopherols, cocoa butter, lavender, sodium PCA and Methyl-Sulfonyl-Methane into a single composition. No patentable invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients. See *In re* Sussman, 1943 C.D. 518; *In re* Huellmantel 139 USPQ 496; *In re* Crockett 126 USPQ 186.

Art Unit: 1655

The references also do not specifically teach the ingredients in the amounts claimed by Applicant. The amount of a specific ingredient in a composition is clearly a result effective parameter that a person of ordinary skill in the art would routinely optimize. Optimization of parameters is a routine practice that would be obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ. It would have been customary for an artisan of ordinary skill to determine the optimal amount of each ingredient in order to best achieve the desired results. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, this optimization of ingredient amount would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention.

From the teaching of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the cited references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Summary

No claim is allowed.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Susan B. McCormick-Ewoldt whose telephone number is (571) 272-0981. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell, can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The official fax number for the group is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/823,175

Art Unit: 1655

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ansun D. We 9-27-05

sbme

SUSAN COE PRIMARY EXAMINER